

My name is Pat Pearson. I am here representing Puget Sound Keeper Alliance. _____. I have been a pollution prevention director at PSA for the last eight years. And in that capacity most of my time is spent working with businesses and industries in a positive way with pollution prevention and control. During that time I have been involved in the process of a boatyard permit and the re-issuance of the boatyard permit. Which as I've been listening is becoming clear to me that has more connection here then I first would have thought. That original permit it does do grab samples, but what they found (Do you think we still got power on this?) time to leave. When we did work and do a re-issuance of that permit and change it we actually increased the number of samples that were taken on stormwater because we found that we couldn't get enough accurate data from only doing it twice a year and that a quarterly sampling was a much better approach. So I really commend Ecology for getting a monitoring requirement, a sampling requirement into this permit. And having it being a quarterly so that I think that there's a chance that we'll get enough accurate data to make some good decisions as we move forward on this in time. The other thing that I would really like to see is that we get the stormwater pollution prevention plans actually submitted by the businesses. My experience has been that businesses, you know, they're trying to run a business, they're trying to make money, they're extremely busy, sometimes the intent is good and the follow through isn't there. Just like it is with any of us that have got too many things to do. And I don't think it's Ecology's plan and it's certainly not Puget Sound Keeper Alliance plan that what we're after is to try and catch anybody at anything. I mean what we'd like to do is have plans in place that protect the water. We don't have to go and try and catch somebody doing something wrong. I think the most efficient way to make sure those plans get written is that they, to make sure they need to be submitted. Because I think it's easy to have them fall through the cracks. And then later you have people, businesses scrambling to get this done because they think somebody is looking over their shoulder all of a sudden. It's much better, you're going to get a much better plan if they know it's their responsibility to do it and to submit it. And that it then would be on file. I think it even puts Ecology within the permit. We listen to how someone's suppose to be identified and in charge as far as pollution prevention goes on site. Sometimes what helps is to actually support that person in their job. And if they have a requirement to do a plan and submit it, they get support within that business to complete that task. Instead of being drawn off to do other things. So I just think it's much better in the long run and it's much better for the business and they're better protected and our water is better protected. So I'd like to see that change in the permit. I would strongly do whatever we can to see if we can't increase funding to Ecology to make sure that they have the capabilities to help oversee this monitoring and also make sure the plans get submitted. And I feel strongly that there does need to be an actual determination by Ecology to allow for the no mixing zones and no exposure. That is not something that should happen by default, by simply checking a box and then not hearing anything. I think that our lives are way too complicated for that to be the system that we are going to rely on. I think that just about does it. I tried to be brief. Thank you.